

INF 382C/INF327E: Understanding and Serving Users

Class time: Tuesday: 3:00 – 6:00 PM
Classroom: UTA 1.502
Course URL: Class materials and announcements will be posted on Canvas:
<https://canvas.utexas.edu/>

Instructor: Yan Zhang
Office: UTA 5.434
Office hrs: Tuesday: 12:00 – 1:00PM; By appointment other times
Tele: 512-471-9448
Email: yanz@ischool.utexas.edu

TA: Xueshu Chen
Email: xueshu_chen@utexas.edu
Office hrs: By appointment

1. Course description

In this class, students will learn about users of information systems, different perspectives to user studies, how to conduct research about user needs and requirements, and user-centered design. The following aspects about “users” will be discussed in the class: human information processing, motivation, and determinants of behavior and behavior intentions. Credibility and persuasion will also be discussed in relation to information technologies.

2. Course objectives

By the end of the course, we will be able to:

- Understand basics about human beings as users of information technologies (and other products)
- Articulate why we need understand users in designing technologies (and other products)
- Design rigorous user studies to analyze and evaluate user needs and requirements for the purpose of designing information technologies (and other products)
- Understand basics of user-centered design and usability

3. Texts

3.1 Required texts

Norman, Donald A. (2002). *The Design of Everyday Things*. New York: Basic Books.

Additional readings will be posted on Canvas.

3.2 Recommended texts

Brown, John Seely, & Duguid, Paul (2002). *The Social Life of Information*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Goodman, E., Kuniavsky, M., & Moed, A. (2012). *Observing the User Experience, Second Edition: A Practitioner's Guide to User Research* (2 edition ed.). Amsterdam ; Boston: Morgan Kaufmann.

Tullis, T., & Albert, B. (2008). *Measuring the User Experience: Collecting, Analyzing, and Presenting Usability Metrics*. Morgan Kaufmann.

4. Policies

4.1 Policies concerning assignments

- Assignments must be submitted by midnight (11:59PM) on the due date.
- In fairness to students who turn in assignments on time, all late papers will be penalized by lowering the earned grade one grade level (e.g., from A- to B+; from B to B-) for each day that the assignment is late.
- No assignment submitted more than one week after the due date will be accepted.
- These penalties will not apply to students who know in advance that they will be submitting an assignment late, and let me know in advance. "In advance" means up until 24 hours before the class session in which the assignment is due.

4.2 Policies on class attendance and participation

- Reading assignments must be done before class so that you can ask questions and participate in discussions in class.
- You must participate in class discussions. In-class discussions and activities play an important role in this class. Extensive participation in class discussion will be an essential element of your learning success on the subject of understanding and serving users. Active involvement in learning increases what is remembered, how well it is assimilated, and how the learning is used in new situations. Class participation will be graded as part of your final grade.
- Attending each class is highly recommended. If you know in advance that you must miss a class, let me know in advance (up until 24 hours before the class session).
- If you miss a class session, unexpectedly, get in contact with me or the TA ASAP.

UT honor code applies in this class. Academic dishonesty, such as plagiarism, cheating, or academic fraud, will not be tolerated in this class. Please refer to the UT General Information Bulletin, Appendix C, Sections 11-304 and 11-802 for more information.

The instructor is happy to provide all appropriate accommodations for qualified students with documented disabilities. The University's Office of the Dean of Students at 471.6259, 471.4641 YYT, can provide further information and referrals as necessary.

5. Grading

In the School of Information, the following guidelines are used in grading:

A	4.00	Excellent. High degree of mastery of the course material.
A-	3.67	Very good.
B+	3.33	More than satisfactory.
B	3.00	Satisfactory. Work consistent with academic expectations of graduate students.
B-	2.67	Less than satisfactory.
C+	2.33	Unsatisfactory. May indicate the instructor's reservations about the student's ability to meet the iSchool's academic requirements.
C	2.00	Unsatisfactory. Indicates the instructor's reservations about the student's ability to meet the iSchool's academic requirements.
C-	1.67	Unsatisfactory. Indicates the instructor's strong reservations about the student's ability to meet the iSchool's academic requirements. Any course with a grade lower than C cannot be counted toward a student's degree.
D	1.00	Unacceptable. Indicates the instructor's very strong reservations about the student's ability to meet the iSchool's academic requirements and to earn a graduate degree. Any course with a grade lower than C cannot be counted toward a student's degree.
F	0.00	Failing.

Semester grades will be computed as follows:

A = 94-100; A- = 90-93
 B+ = 87-89; B = 84-86; B- = 80-83
 C+ = 77-79; C = 74-76; C- = 70-73
 D+ = 67-69; D = 60-66
 F = anything below 59

For all your presentations in this class (topic presentations and final project presentations), you are encouraged to use Powerpoint or some other presentation program (such as Open Office or Lotus Symphony). The grading rubric for the presentation is listed below (Note: This [rubric](#) was developed by [Information Technology Evaluation Services, NC Department of Public Instruction](#). However, it was slightly modified for our purposes.)

Organization	
Unacceptable	Audience cannot understand presentation because there is no sequence of information
Acceptable	Audience has difficulty following presentation because presenter jumps around

Good	Presenter presents information in logical sequence which audience can follow
Excellent	Presenter presents information in logical, interesting sequence which audience can follow
Subject Knowledge	
Unacceptable	Presenter does not have grasp of information; presenter cannot answer questions about subject
Acceptable	Presenter is uncomfortable with information and is able to answer only rudimentary questions
Good	Presenter is at ease with expected answers to all questions, but fails to elaborate
Excellent	Presenter demonstrates full knowledge (more than required) by answering all class questions with explanations and elaboration
Graphics	
Unacceptable	Presenter uses superfluous graphics or no graphics
Acceptable	Presenter occasionally uses graphics that rarely support text and presentation
Good	Presenter's graphics relate to text and presentation
Excellent	Presenter's graphics explain and reinforce screen text and presentation
Spelling & Grammar	
Unacceptable	Presenter's presentation has more than one misspelling and more than one grammatical error
Acceptable	Presentation has exactly one misspelling and/or exactly one grammatical error, which a spell- or grammar checker would catch
Good	Presentation has exactly one misspelling and exactly one grammatical error, which a spell- or grammar checker would not catch
Excellent	Presentation has no misspellings or grammatical errors
Eye Contact	
Unacceptable	Presenter reads all of report with no eye contact
Acceptable	Presenter occasionally makes eye contact, but still reads most of report
Good	Presenter maintains eye contact most of the time but frequently returns to notes
Excellent	Presenter maintains eye contact with audience, seldom returning to notes
Elocution	
Unacceptable	Presenter mumbles, incorrectly pronounces terms, and speaks too quietly for audience in the back of room to hear
Acceptable	Presenter's voice is low. Presenter incorrectly pronounces terms. Audience members have difficulty hearing presentation.
Good	Presenter's voice is clear. Presenter pronounces most words correctly. Most audience members can hear presentation.
Excellent	Presenter uses a clear voice and correct, precise pronunciation of terms so that all audience members can hear presentation.

6. Assignments

6.1 Overview

Here are the assignments for this course.

	Assignment	Due date	Points
1	Prepare questions for each class and participate in class discussion	Each Monday by 2:00PM	15
	Class attendance		5
2	Topic presentation	Varies dates	15
3	IRB Training	April 19	5
4	<i>Group project</i> – A user research proposal		
	Literature review	March 1	15
	Research methods	Apr. 12	15
	Final project presentation	May 3	15
	Final report	May 6	15
			100

6.2 Requirements for each assignment

1. *Prepare questions and participate in class discussion*

Students are required to physically attend each class and arrive at each class promptly. Class attendance will be graded as part of your final grade. If you know in advance that you must miss a class, let me know in advance (up until 24 hours before the class session). If you miss a class session, unexpectedly, get in contact with me ASAP.

Before each class, students are required to prepare one question, either about the readings or inspired by the readings, and post the question to Canvas discussion board by 2:00PM on each Monday.

The instructional materials of this class provide a knowledge structure to assist you in learning the subject matter of this class. However, **critical thinking** and **problem solving abilities** are often cultivated by discussing problems and issues of interest with your peers. Therefore, you must participate in class discussions. Class participation will be graded as part of your final grade.

2. *Topic presentation*

Each student will take on one topic from the topics listed in the table and present the topic to the class. Each presentation should last about 20-30 minutes. There will be additional 5 minutes for question and answer. Use visual aids such as PowerPoint in your presentation.

Topics		Date	Presenter
Human information behavior			
1	Ellis' information seeking model	Mar. 1	
2	Kuhlthau's information search process	Mar. 1	
Empirical user studies			
3	Does size matter?: Investigating the impact of mobile phone screen size on users' perceived usability, effectiveness and efficiency	Apr. 19	
4	Usability testing finds problems for novice users of pediatric portals	Apr. 19	
5	The impact of search engine selection and sorting criteria on vaccination beliefs and attitudes	Feb. 23	
6	How do users evaluate the credibility of web sites	Feb. 23	
7	What do exploratory searchers look at in a faceted search interface	Mar. 8	
Research methods			
8	Focus groups	Mar. 29	
9	Ethnographic method	Mar. 29	
10	Diary method	Mar. 29	
11	Transaction log analysis	Apr. 5	
12	Contextual inquiry	Apr. 12	
13	Cognitive walkthrough	Apr. 19	

The requirements for the presentations are outlined in the following table. For some topics, suggested materials are provided. You are not required to use these materials. You are also encouraged to use materials other than listed to support your presentation.

<p>Human information behavior</p> <p>Presentations could include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Describe the model and elements in the model - Introduce one or multiple empirical studies that support/use the model - Situations that the model applies - Merits and limitations <p>1. Ellis' information seeking model</p> <p>Suggested readings: Ellis, D., D. Cox & K. Hall (1993). A Comparison of the Information Seeking Patterns of Researchers in the Physical and Social Sciences. <i>Journal of Documentation</i> 49, no. 4: 356-369.</p> <p>Ellis, D. (1997). Modeling the information seeking patterns of engineers and research scientists in an industrial environment. <i>Journal of Documentation</i>, 53(4), 384-403.</p> <p>Meho, L., & Tibbe, H. (2003). Modeling the information-seeking behavior and use of social scientists: Ellis's study revisited. <i>Journal of American Society for Information Science</i>, 54(6): 570-87.</p> <p>2. Kuhlthau's Information processing model</p> <p>Suggested readings: Kuhlthau, Carol C. (1991). Inside the search process: Information seeking from the user's perspective. <i>Journal of the American Society for Information Science</i>, 42(5), 361-371. Also available at</p>
--

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/jtoc?ID=27981>

Kuhlthau, Carol Collier. (2005). Kuhlthau's information search process. In Karen Fisher, Sanda Erdelez, & Lynne (E.F.) McKechnie (Eds.), *Theories of information behavior* (pp. 230-234). Medford, NJ: Information Today.

Empirical user studies

Presentations could include but are not limited to:

- Purpose of the study
- Background information (related literature)
- Methods used in the study
- Data analysis
- Results
- Implications

3. Does Size Matter?: Investigating the Impact of Mobile Phone Screen Size on Users' Perceived Usability, Effectiveness and Efficiency

Raptis, D., Tselios, N., Kjeldskov, J., & Skov, M. B. (2013). Does Size Matter?: Investigating the Impact of Mobile Phone Screen Size on Users' Perceived Usability, Effectiveness and Efficiency. *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Human-computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services*, 127-136.

4. Usability testing finds problems for novice users of pediatric portals

Britto, M. T., Jimison, H. B., Munafo, J. K., Wissman, J., Rogers, M. L., & Hersh, W. (2009). Usability testing finds problems for novice users of pediatric portals. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA*, 16(5), 660-669.

5. The impact of search engine selection and sorting criteria on vaccination beliefs and attitudes

Allam, A., Schulz, P. J., & Nakamoto, K. (2014). The Impact of Search Engine Selection and Sorting Criteria on Vaccination Beliefs and Attitudes: Two Experiments Manipulating Google Output. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 16(4), <http://www.jmir.org/2014/4/e100/>

6. How do users evaluate the credibility of web sites

Fogg, B. J., Soohoo, C., Danielson, D. R., Marable, L., Stanford, J., & Tauber, E. R. (2003). How Do Users Evaluate the Credibility of Web Sites?: A Study with over 2,500 Participants. *Proceedings of the 2003 Conference on Designing for User Experiences*, 1-15.

7. What do exploratory searchers look at in a faceted search interface

Kules, B., Capra, R., Banta, M., & Sierra, T. (2009). What do exploratory searchers look at in a faceted search interface? In *Proceedings of JCDL'09*, 313-322.

Research methods for user or usability studies

Presentations could include but are not limited to:

- Introduce the research method, pros and cons
- How to use the method

- Find a user study (case study) that exemplifies the use of the method
 - Explain how the research methods is implemented in the study
- Find the case study by yourself. If you have any problems, contact the instructor at yanz@ischool.utexas.edu

8. Focus groups
9. Ethnographic method
10. Diary method
11. Transaction log analysis
12. Contextual inquiry
13. Cognitive walkthrough

3. IRB training

Each student is expected to complete the four-part Human Participant Training provided by the UT office of Research Compliance and Support and to demonstrate to the instructor successful completion of this online training. To access the training, see http://www.utexas.edu/research/rsc/humansubjects/training/human_subjects.html. Confirmation of completion should be emailed to the instructor (yanz@ischool.utexas.edu).

4. Group projects: A user study proposal

You will self-select yourselves into teams to work on the project. The maximum number of members in a team is 4.

The purpose of a user study often is to explore a community/group of users' needs, requirements, and behaviors to inform the design or redesign of a technology or a service. You will propose a topic that of your interest, discuss the topic with the instructor, and work on it upon the instructor's approval.

Following these steps for your project:

- 1) Propose a user research topic and discuss the topic with the instructor.
- 2) Do a preliminary literature search and reading to define or refine the topic (and further research questions) for your empirical user research. Write a well-elaborated description of your topic and brief literature review (focusing on important ones). Both topic description and literature should lead to your research objectives/purposes. (2-3 pages or 1000-1500 words)

More information about the literature review: Each group will review 20-40 papers (journal papers, conference proceedings, book chapters, or books) regarding the existing related literature on your topic. The literature review is expected to be about 2 pages long, 11-12 fonts, single spaced, excluding the citations. At the end of the literature review, citations should be provided in APA style (Here is a good reference for APA style: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>).

The literature review will be evaluated from three aspects:

- a. *Comprehensiveness*: whether your review covers the most influential work on your topic and whether it covers various perspectives from which the topic was explored.
 - b. *Quality of your writing*: whether your review is well structured and easy to follow.
 - c. *Format of the citations*: whether your citations follow the APA style.
- 3) Discuss with the instructor what methods you will employ to answer your research questions and submit a brief description of your research design (half-page maximum).
- 4) Based on your research design, develop a data collection tool that you will use to collect data to address your research questions. Below are several examples showing specific information that you need to provide for the research methods that you propose:

1. Survey Questionnaire

Base on your conceptual framework and/or research questions, you identify:

- A. Variables that you will collect
- B. Scales to be used for measurement
- C. How to collect and handle data?

2. Experiment

Base on your conceptual framework and/or research questions, you identify:

- A. Variables that you will collect
- B. Scales to be used for measurement
- C. How to record and handle data?

3. Interview

- A. Interview guide with questions you will be asking

- 5) Final report. The final report should be an integration of your problem statement, literature review, research questions, and research methods. Simply assemble the individual assignments will not produce a coherent report.
- 6) Presentation. Each presentation is about 20-25 minutes long. There will be additional 5 minutes for Q&A. The presentation will be evaluated using the rubric outlined in Section 5.

7. Schedule & Readings

1. Schedule

	Date	Subjects
1	Jan. 19	Introduction
2	Jan. 26	Human information processing <i>Due: Select topic presentation</i>
3	Feb. 2	The psychology of everyday actions
4	Feb. 9	Goal-directed behavior <i>Due: Inform the instructor of your research group and research topic</i>
5	Feb. 16	Motivation
6	Feb. 23	Persuasion and Credibility
7	March 1	Information behavior and information practices <i>Due: Literature review</i>
8	March 8	Cognitive and social perspectives to user studies
9	March 15	**Spring break**
10	March 22	**Conference**
11	March 29	User research methods (1)
12	Apr. 5	User research methods (2)
13	Apr. 12	User-centered design <i>Due: Research methods</i>
14	Apr.19	Usability <i>Due: Complete IRB training & Submit the certificate</i>
15	Apr. 26	Ethics Guest: Staff from the IRB office
16	May 3	Project presentation
	May 6	<i>Due: Final report</i>

2. Readings

1. Jan. 19 **Introduction and review of syllabus**

2. Jan. 26 **Human information processing**

Simon, H. A. (1979). Information Processing Models of Cognition. Annual Review of Psychology, 30(1), 363.

John, B. E. (2003) Information processing and skilled behavior. In J. M. Carroll, (Ed.), Toward a multidisciplinary science of human computer interaction. Morgan Kaufman.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. Science, 185(4157), 1124-1131.

Larson, K., & Czerwinski, M. (1998). Web page design: implications of memory, structure and scent for information retrieval. *Proceeding of Computer-Human Interaction Conference 1998*, 18-23.

Recommended Readings:

Schneider, W., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: I. Detection, search, and attention. *Psychological Review*, 84(1), 1-66.

Shiffrin, R. M., & Schneider, W. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: II. Perceptual learning, automatic attending and a general theory. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 127-190.

3. Feb. 2 **The psychology of everyday actions**

Norman, Donald A. (2002). *The design of everyday things* (with a new introduction). New York: Basic Books. [Read: Chapter 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5](#)

4. Feb. 9 **Goal-directed behavior**

Ajzen, I. (1991). Theories of Cognitive Self-Regulation: The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.

Bandura, A. (1991). Theories of Cognitive Self-Regulation: Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 248-287.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319-340.

5. Feb. 16 **Motivation**

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *The American psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256-273.

Oh, S. (2012). The characteristics and motivations of health answerers for sharing information, knowledge, and experiences in online environments. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*. 63(3), 543-557.

6. Feb. 23 **Persuasion and credibility**

Chaiken, S., Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (1996). Principles of persuasion. In Higgins, Edward Tory, Kruglanski, Arie W. (Eds). *Social psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles*. (pp. 702-742). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press

Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(5), 752-766.

Fogg, B. J. (2009). A behavior model for persuasive design. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Persuasive Technology*, 1-7.

Rieh, S., & Hilligoss, B. (2007). College students' credibility judgments in the information-seeking process. *The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning*, 49-71.

7. March 1 **Information behavior and information practices**

Dervin, Brenda, & Nilan, Michael. (1986). Information needs and uses. In Martha Williams (Ed.), *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* (pp. 3-33). Medford, NJ: Learned Information.

Wilson, T.D. (1999). Models in information behavior research. *Journal of Documentation*, 55(3), 249-270.

McKenzie, P. J. (2003). A model of information practices in accounts of everyday-life information seeking. *Journal of Documentation*, 59(1), 19-44.

Borlund, P. (2003). The concept of relevance in IR. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 54(10), 913-925.

8. March 8 **Cognitive and social perspectives to user studies in information behavior**

Belkin, N. J., Oddy, R. N., & Brooks, H. M. (1982). ASK for information retrieval: Part I. background and theory *Journal of Documentation*, 38(2), 61-71.

Borgman, Christine L. (1989). All users of information retrieval systems are not created equal: an exploration into individual differences. *Information Process & Management*, 25(3), 237-251.

Brown, John Seely, & Duguid, Paul. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 40-57.

Chatman, E.A. (1999). A theory of life in the round. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50(3), 207-217.

9. March 15 ****Spring break****

10. March 22 ****Conference****

11. March 29 **User research methods (1)**

Wang, Peiling (1999). Methodologies and methods for user behavioral research. Williams, Martha E., Ed. Annual review of information science and technology. Medford, NJ: Information Today, pp. 53-99.

Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2005). Qualitative interviews in psychology: Problems and possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2(4), 281-307.

Lee, R. P., Thompson, B., Whybrow, P., & Rapley, T. (2015). Talking About Looking: Three Approaches to Interviewing Carers of People With Rheumatoid Arthritis About Information Seeking. *Qualitative Health Research*. doi: 10.1177/1049732315599373

Wright, R. B., & Converse, S. A. (1992). Method Bias and concurrent verbal protocol in Software Usability Testing. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 36(16), 1220-1224.

12. April 5 **User research methods (2)**

Dillman, D. A. (1991). The Design and Administration of Mail Surveys. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 225-249.

Capra, R., Marchionini, G., Oh, J. S., Stutzman, F., Zhang, Y. (2007). Effects of structure and interaction style on distinct search tasks. *Proceedings of ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL)* (pp. 442-451).

St. Jean, B. (2014). Devising and implementing a card-sorting technique for a longitudinal investigation of the information behavior of people with type 2 diabetes. *Library & Information Science Research*, 36(1), 16-26.

Eysenbach, G., & Kohler, C. (2002). How do consumers search for and appraise health information on the world wide web? Qualitative study using focus groups, usability tests, and in-depth interviews. *BMJ*, 324(7337), 573-577.

13. April 12 **User-centered design**

Abras, C., Maloney-Krichmar, D., & Preece, J. (2004). User-centered design. Bainbridge, W. *Encyclopedia of Human-Computer Interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 37(4), 445-456.

Schweikardt, E. (2009). User centered is off center. *Interaction*, May + Jun, 12-15.

Wixon, D., Holtzblatt, K., & Knox, S. (1990). Contextual design: An emergent view of system design. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 329-336.

Spinuzzi, C. (2005). The Methodology of Participatory Design. *Technical Communication*, 52(2), 163-174.

Kensing, F., & Blomberg, J. (1998). Participatory Design: Issues and Concerns. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 7(3-4), 167-185.

14. April 19 **Usability**

Thomas, P., & Macredie, R.D. (2002). Introduction to the new usability. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 9(2), 69-73.

Scott, K.M. (2009). Is usability obsolete? *Interaction*, May + Jun, 6-11.

Polson, P. G., Lewis, C., Rieman, J., & Wharton, C. (1992). Cognitive walkthroughs: a method for theory-based evaluation of user interfaces. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 36(5), 741-773.

Nielsen, J. (2008). 25 years in usability. Available at: <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/25-years-in-usability/>

Jeffries, R., & Desurvire, H. (1992). Usability Testing vs. Heuristic Evaluation: Was There a Contest? *SIGCHI Bull.*, 24(4), 39-41.

15. April 26 **Ethics**
Guest speaker: (IRB office)

Germeni, E., Bianchi, M., Valcarengi, D., & Schulz, P. J. (2015). Longitudinal qualitative exploration of cancer information-seeking experiences across the disease trajectory: the INFO-SEEK protocol. *BMJ Open*, 5(10), e008933.

McNeil, Donald G. Jr. (Oct. 2010). U.S. apologizes for syphilis tests in Guatemala. *The New York Times*.

Harmon, Amy (April 22, 2010). Tribe wins fight to limit research of its DNA. *The New York Times*.

16. May 3 **Project presentation**